THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. 2 JUNE, 1950

COMMENTS AND NOTES

A PERIODICAL dealing with the study of the Eastern Churches is sorely handicapped to-day. To understand the full meaning of Orthodoxy, it is essential that the synthesis which the Holy Spirit working in history has brought to fruit in the flowing together of the Hellenic and Slav spirit, as well as the contribution of the Arab-speaking Christian world, should be given its right place and emphasis. Yet this is impossible or nearly so. Insistence on Pan-Orthodoxy is the only interpretation of the Orthodox Church that can satisfy our task, and that will always be kept in mind by us. If, therefore, at present there appears to be a disproportion in both the provenance and the matter of our articles, it is because of the insurmountable fact that much of Slav Orthodoxy is shut away from us, and not because we desire to be partial. Indeed (yet we say it with diffidence) our Anglican contribution to Reunion may well be to indicate and admire this richness of tradition in the Orthodox Church, which our Orthodox brethren in the complications of a broken world at times will appreciate less clearly than we do: this deep unity through diversity, this promise of a deeper co-inherence.

As we get on our feet again, we hope to have news sent to us from the ancient centres of Orthodoxy, which have been great all through Christian history, because they are representative of splendid and enduring manifestations of the life and mind of the Christian Church.

We note with grief the death of His Beatitude the late Patriarch of Serbia Gavrilo on May 7th at Belgrade. An obituary will appear later in these pages. As a mark of respect and sympathy with the Church of Serbia, the Association arranged for the offering of a solemn Requiem for the repose of the late Patriarch's soul on Tuesday, June 6th, at 11 a.m. at St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens, S.W. 5. On the occasion of the Patriarch's visit to this country in 1945 many of us remember his presence at the Association's Solemn Eucharist at the Grosvenor Chapel and the subsequent reception at the Old Hall, Lincoln's Inn. It was the expression of admiration and homage to a great Christian leader of his people and an old friend of our Church.

The late Patriarch, a native of Montenegro, died at the age of 68. He was educated at Belgrade, and went to Constantinople and Athens for his theological training. During the 1914–18 war, he served with the Montenegrin army in the Red Cross, and on his return was made Metropolitan of Montenegro. In 1938 he was elected Patriarch of Serbia. For his heroic stand on behalf of liberty and his active part in calling the boy King Peter

to the throne, he was first arrested by the Germans, and later sent to the infamous concentration camp at Dachau. He was in exile from his country for five years, and returned to Belgrade in 1946. Although he called on his clergy to co-operate fully with Marshal Tito's government, he refused to recognize the government-sponsored League of Serbian priests, and was strongly opposed to the new method of "popular election" of priests and bishops. After a life of suffering and tragedy, especially in these later years, we pray for the rest and peace of the soul of this servant of God, who through love of his divine Master and of his people and country, was called upon to face the full brunt of evil and its attendant suffering in the troubled courses of the Europe of the last thirty-five years.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF MALABAR

by H.R.H. Prince Peter of Greece

TUCKED away in the far south-western corner of India, and tightly fitted in between the Arabian Sea and the mountain range known as the Western Ghats, there exists a portion of this vast sub-continent of Asia that, in many ways, has more in common with the eastern Mediterranean than with the rest of the country to which it belongs. This is the coast of Malabar, comprising the province of the same name, and which, until very recently, was made up of the two Indian principalities of Cochin and Travancore, now amalgamated into the Kerala Union. So great are the affinities with the Near East that, to describe it, the expression "the Mediterranean in India" springs to the mind immediately.

The surprised traveller in these parts will come across villages, nestling in the tropical jungle, that have monumental crosses standing at their entrance, and enormous, cathedral-like churches in their midst, denoting that the inhabitants are Christians, or as they are known here, Nazareni. He will also meet women carrying the household water which they have gone to fetch at the village well in either brass or earthenware vessels, clad as if they had come straight from some Arab village of Palestine. In this part of India where other women go about bare-breasted, one might suppose them to be Muslims. Finally, if he wanders to some of the cities of the coast, such as Ernakulam or Mattanchery, he will be further taken aback by the presence of synagogues in some of the main streets, with black or white complexioned attendants according to the alleged degree of antiquity of the Jewish congregation to which they belong.

The Christians, however, are by far the largest group. If the Roman Catholics and the Protestants be included, their number, together with those who follow Eastern rituals, is at least four millions. For this reason I propose to deal exclusively with these in the following article. It seems to me too that, from the point of view of one who professes Christianity, there is quite a lesson to be learnt from even a superficial knowledge of the Churches of Malabar, a lesson which will enrich any average person's sense of the relativity of things and, if he is honest and humble, will make him realize that he knows very little of the origins and history, not to mention the tenets, of the religion he claims to follow.

It seems altogether fantastic at first that this south-western coast of India should in any way be linked to the eastern Mediterranean. The distance is so enormous, apart from the fact that a whole section of the Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea, lies between Malabar and the Near East. It is only when one has come to comprehend how much wind affects this part of the world, how weather, rainfall, trade and human migrations are dependant upon it, that any kind of connexion between the two areas becomes understandable.

The Egyptian navigator, Hippalus, is credited with having first discovered in the first century A.D. a direct, forty-day sailing route from Arabia to India, without having to hug the coast all the way as former mariners had done.

From then onwards commercial ties between the Greco-Roman world and that of south India grew closer, chiefly with the purpose of providing the former with spices. The Byzantines continued the established relations, but were forced out of the traffic by the Sassanian Persians, who, in turn, lost it to the Arabs in the late seventh century A.D. For a long time afterwards the West only received goods from India through the intermediary of these hardy desert-dwellers until the Portuguese in the last few years of the fifteenth century re-established direct trade between the Occident and the Orient.

When, after discovering Brazil and rounding the Cape of Good Hope, Vasco da Gama landed in Calicut in 1498, he and his companions were astounded to find many Christians established here on these unexplored shores. Their immediate reaction was, unfortunately, an acquisitive one. "These churches belong to the Pope!" they exclaimed, and at once set about indoctrinating the natives with what was expected of them in this respect.

In the beginning, the Christians of Malabar were unsuspecting. Cut off from the rest of Christendom for centuries they were ignorant of the very existence of a Western, Roman Church. The only contacts they had had with their co-religionists elsewhere had been long before the Schism of the eleventh century when proselytizing Nestorian missionaries, in the course of their tremendous expansion over the whole of Asia, had reached this distant land also.

For this reason the Christians to whom the Portuguese preached were either descendants of the converts whom the Apostle St. Thomas is said to have made after he landed on the coast of Malabar as early as the year A.D. 52, thus introducing Christianity to these parts for the first time, or those who had accepted the teachings of the Nestorian heresy and had come under the sway of the leader of that Church, the Catholicos of the East, residing in Ctesiphon-Seleucia, near Baghdad, and his immediate subordinate, the Patriarch of Babylon, whose seat was at Nineveh, close to modern Mosul.

When, however, the Malabaris found that they were being asked to recognize the Pope as the supreme head of all the Christian world, to reject their own doctrines and tenets as heretical, to accept the worship of Western images, and henceforward to have their bishops ordained exclusively by the Latin clergy, they rebelled.

"Ours is the original Faith," they exclaimed, "taught to us by the Apostle Thomas himself, and we see no reason to modify it in favour of your concepts!"

As a result the Portuguese introduced the Inquisition, and many an unfortunate cleric or layman of the Indian Church was dragged to Goa (under Lisbon to this day) to suffer the excrutiating torments of the reforming tribunal.

In desperation, the Christians of St. Thomas—as the Malabar Churches faithful sometimes call themselves—appealed to the Eastern Patriarchs for assistance.

Unfamiliar with the distinctions which had grown up within the Greek Orthodox Church of Byzantium over the centuries, because of their long isolation, they sent out appeals for help indiscriminately to Iranian Nestorians and to Syrian Jacobites alike. The latter alone responded, no doubt because the Persian and Chaldean followers of Nestorius had suffered eclipse through the inroads of the Mongol and Moslem invasions of the Near East. They sent out envoys to ordain bishops and guide the ailing flock in India. But the Portuguese intercepted them and carried them off to Goa, where they never were heard of again. This was too much and proved to be the last straw of provocation. Nearly the entire Christian community of Malabar rebelled and solemnly swore they would have no more to do with the Roman Catholic invaders.

Happily for them, respite came with the supplanting of the Portuguese by the Protestant Dutch. Indifferent to the religious convictions of the natives, provided they were allowed to trade with them, the latter, at the end of the seventeenth century, established a period of tolerance and peace which was continued when the British arrived in 1796. This does not imply that the Malabar Churches were henceforward entirely free from disturbances, for, as we will see, interior troubles did brew up. But, outside interference at least ceased, and the community was left to thrash out its own difficulties in perfect independence and liberty.

To-day, the Malabar Christian Churches are divided into the following entities:—

1. The Nestorian, Assyro-Chaldean Church, numbering some twenty thousand followers, with headquarters at Trichur in the State of Cochin. The leader of this division is still the ancient Catholicos of the East, created in A.D. 231 by the Prelates of Jerusalem. His is now Mar Eshai Shimun XXIII, resident to-day in Chicago, Ill., and an American citizen. These Christians believe that Christ has two distinct hypostases, one divine, the other human. He therefore, as their Creed runs, "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost and became man, and was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary." For this reason they still uphold that Mary is the Mother of Christ and not the Mother of God. This is a dying Church, with no bishop to lead it, and torn by interior petty personal strife. The only other branch of this once glorious, evangelical congregation is situated in Kurdistan, northern Irak and Syria, where the massacre of the Assyrians by the Arabs, just after the first World War is still vividly remembered. Their young men, there, now serve with great distinction in the British Royal Air Force's

ground battalions of Assyrian levies. They were greatly instrumental in defeating Rashid Aly's abortive attempt to hand over Mesopotamia to the Germans in the second World War.

2. The Jacobite Syrian Church, with about one hundred and twenty thousand adherents, recognizing the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, to-day resident in Homs, Syria, and with their Metropolitan See situated at Alway, in Travancore State. There is an envoy of Mar Ephraim Barsoum, the Jacobite Patriarch, who has established his headquarters in the village of Pathanamthitta, in Travancore, and who somewhat pompously styles himself "His Excellency, Mar Julius, Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See of Antioch." These people are the descendants of those Indians converted to Christianity by the Apostle Thomas, and who, persecuted by the Catholic Portuguese, appealed for help to the Patriarchs of the East, receiving assistance only from the Jacobites of Syria. Although attached to a Monophysite, and thus, from our point of view, heretical authority, they nevertheless don't seem to be strict followers of the doctrines of that creed. They recognize two natures in Christ, the divine and the human, which they, like us however, consider united in the person of our Saviour. Their Creed is the generally accepted orthodox Nicene Confession.

3. The Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar, made up of some one hundred and eighteen thousand faithful, detached from Antioch and with at their head His Holiness Moran Mar Baselios Geevarghese II, living at Thinivella, near Kottayam in Travancore, and styling himself Metropolitan of Malabar and also Catholicos of the East. A law suit about church property, which has already lasted thirty years and which provides a substantial livelihood for the best lawyers in India, opposes these Christians to the Jacobite See of Antioch. If I am not mistaken, this is really an expression of the reluctance of the Malabar native Church to accept the Monophysite connexion with Syria, and an attempt to return to the time when, long before heretical movements in the Near East disturbed the unity of Christendom—really the expression of nationalist trends in the Egyptian, Abyssinian, Syrian, Mesopotamian, Armenian and Persian possessions of the Byzantine Emperors—they were simply the converts of St. Thomas, the Apostle of India. They also recite the Nicene Creed at their services.

4. The Mar Thoma Church, one hundred and twenty thousand strong, a reformed section of the original Malabar Church, which assumed this name to commemorate St. Thomas when it broke away from the Jacobite Syrian Church some one hundred and fifty years ago. This took place under the influence of the British Church Missionary Society. The Marthomaites, as they are often called, have a Metropolitan at their head whom they ordain themselves, to-day the Most Reverend Yuhanon Marthoma, an outstanding prelate whose picture appeared in *Life* magazine at the occasion of the World Churches Congress at Amsterdam recently, and whose residence is at the Travancore town of Tinivelly. The chief reforms for which this Church is remarkable are: the abolition of all prayers for the dead and to the saints; the discouragement of auricular confession; the conduct of the service (Qurbana) in Malayalam, and the language of

Malabar, instead of the liturgical Syriac of the other Churches. Needless to say, this movement has got into very bad odour for its "protestantism" with the Syrians, although otherwise, in point of fact, its Creed is indistinguishable from theirs.

5. The Latin-Catholic Church, which we would more correctly term the Roman-Catholic, but which is known by the above appellation in Malabar. This is the hierarchy established by the Portuguese, with to-day the largest following in south India—two million—and with an archbishop at its head, whose seat is at Verapoly, part of Ernakulam, the capital of the State of Cochin. They are directly under the Vatican.

6. The Romo-Syrian Church, comprising over half a million, who are Uniates or Eastern Christians recognizing the supremacy of the Pope, but have been allowed to retain their oriental rites. They have an archbishop at Ernakulam, Cochin.

7. The United Church of South India, which has now achieved autonomy. This body has just under a million adherents.

8. The Independent Church of Thozhiur or Anyoor. This is a very small entity, with only one parish, situated just over the border of Cochin, in the coastal area of the province of Malabar proper. It came into being in the eighteenth century, when the ordination of its bishop was contested by other members of the clergy. At present, this bishop is ordained by the Mar Thoma Metropolitan, but it is not certain that this arrangement will continue. Actually, this Church is so small that it is only mentioned here because an enumeration of the Churches of Malabar would be incomplete without it.

For one, like myself, who has been fortunate enough to get to know these Churches at first hand, there is something eminently satisfactory and inspiring in this addition to one's knowledge and experience. I have felt that it would be selfish to keep this entirely to myself, and that something, however brief, should be published for the benefit of others, and also to make these little-known Christians more widely appreciated.

May the tremendous development of present-day communications throughout the world and the greatly intensified inter-relations of men from everywhere again bring these ancient followers of Christ into closer contact with the rest of us for the greater glory of Christendom and of its earthly realm.

THE EVANGELISTIC WORK OF THE CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

(conclusion)

by P. I. Bratsiotis

IN the last few years there has been much evangelistic activity in the provinces, as well as in Athens, brought about not only through the provincial Metropolitans and the officially appointed preachers of their dioceses, but also through provincial religious organizations. Of these the most important are in the Piraeus (Agape Association), Corinth, Patras, Joannina, Kalamai, Mesolongi, Mytilene, Volos, and

Crete; the most important of all are in Salonika, where, apart from the brilliant work of the "Zoe" preachers, there has existed since 1929 the work brought into being by the association named "Apostolic Diaconate" (which is not to be confused with the official ecclesiastical organization of the same name); this work is being extended to other parts of northern Greece and has its own periodical, named *Apolytrosis*.

25. Side by side with the religious movements which have here been described, and which owe their general extension to the private initiative of certain clergy and laity, there has not been a lack of serious evangelistic efforts which owe their initiation to the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece and to the local ecclesiastical authorities; these have multiplied since the war. The most noteworthy of such efforts were those of the Archbishops of Athens, Germanos, who died in 1897, and Chrysostom, who died in 1938, as well as Hierotheos the Archbishop of Patras, who died in 1902, and noteworthy efforts are being made by many contemporary members of the hierarchy.

26. A special ecclesiastical organization called *Apostolic Diaconate* was founded some years ago for the purpose of promoting and systematizing evangelistic work in the Church of Greece; it is administered by a Council over which the Archbishop of Athens presides and which consists of bishops who are members of the Holy Synod and professors in the theological faculty of the university of Athens. This organization has just been reorganized under the direction of Professor Vellas of the university, and for one year it has developed brilliant activity; it has founded a training college in which preachers, confessors and catechists can be trained after their academic education, and it is publishing special books to assist these clergy and preachers and catechists, as well as books for the religious edification of the army, those in prison, and the sick; it is making provisions for the extension and modernization of evangelistic work in all directions.

27. Last of all, mention should be made of the State's reorganization of the *chaplaincy services* in the army and especially of the foundation of a special department directing this service in the ministry of military affairs; this department has been entrusted to an experienced army chaplain, the Archimandrite Cyprian Poulakos. The service has been strengthened by the enlistment of several theologians, both clerical and lay. Thus the number of opportunities for the kerygma has been multiplied where the army is concerned in various units, and special edifying periodicals are gaining a wide circulation in the army.

28. We have examined at great length the evangelistic efforts being made in Free Greece, and we have left only a small amount of space in this present essay for the consideration of the evangelistic work done in the other autocephalous churches, where, in contrast with the progress made in Greece, very little progress has been made for the following reasons.

(i) The centre of gravity of Hellenism has moved into Free Greece.

(ii) The State-regime in the lands of the Churches which were under Turkish rule was very unfavourable to the development of living philanthropic movements arising from private initiative, as we can prove from the need which Makrakes had of moving his field of activity from Constantinople to Athens.

(iii) The energy of the ecclesiastical authorities was very largely consumed in concerns appertaining to the secular and political protection of their flocks because the Turkish conqueror recognized the Church as the organ of the limited self-government allowed to the Greek nation.

(iv) At least as long as the old Turkish rule continued the need for evangelism was smaller in the Churches concerned in that the Church's influence among the people was greater and Christian tradition was better preserved and the dangers to the Christian faith and way of life were not so great, so that the ecclesiastical authorities contented themselves with the admittedly great influence of the inexhaustible treasure of Orthodox worship, granted that most of their flock were regularly participating in it.

29. But nevertheless there has not been a lack of evangelistic efforts, both on the part of the pastors and ecclesiastical authorities and on the part of parishes; such efforts have been most intense in the great urban centres, such as Constantinople, Salonika, Smyrna, Cairo and Alexandria, and in Cyprus and Crete.[5] It should be noticed that a more lively religious activity has been observed in these Churches since the war. The clerical and lay activity in connexion with the periodical *Phos* in Constantinople in recent years, since this new periodical has appeared, is particularly noteworthy, as well as the movement in Cyprus, where various religious organizations have combined to form the "Pan-Cypriot Federation of Orthodox Christian Societies," with the periodical *Christianlike Anagennesis* as their common organ.

30. A lively evangelistic movement has been observed in recent years in the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States of America. To this the Greek Archbishopric there imparts the general character which it has; but religious movements initiated by private enterprise are not lacking, and both periodicals and edifying books are being published; Orthodox catechetical schools are functioning in some parishes. The theological college "of the Cross" in Pomfret in Connecticutt provides education for the Greek clergy of America since its foundation ten years ago. An analogous evangelistic activity is not entirely lacking in the numerous Greek ecclesiastical parishes which have been formed in all foreign countries in Europe, Asia, America, and Australia.

III. General Results

The consequence of all these religious movements in the Greek Church as a whole during the last few years is the rekindling of the religious sentiment of the Greek people, the widespread circulation of the Bible, thirst for the Word of God, and a great increase in the numbers attending church, most of all in Athens and the larger Greek cities, together with more frequent resort to the Holy Sacraments of Confession and Holy Communion, increased interest in Christianity among the representatives of science, art

[5] Periodicals issued in centres outside Greece (or in north Greece while it was still Turkish).
Constantinople: *Ekklesiastike Alêtheia; Anagennesis: Poemen.*
Salonika: *Gregory Palamas.*
Smyrna: *Hieros Polycarpos.*
Alexandria: *Pantainos and Ekklesiastikos Pharos.*
Cyprus: *Keryx.*
Crete: *Christianikon Phos.*

and politics, and the gradual regeneration in Christ of the Greek people. But the work in this direction which still remains to be done is great and heavy. For, side by side with that great part of the populace which is now under the beneficial influence of the Church and the Gospel and is ready to co-operate with that influence for the progress of evangelistic work, there is another part of the populace which is not to be regarded as insignificant as regards numbers, on the opposite side, attached to ideas which are not merely materialistic but also anti-Christian, while yet another part of the populace is no less threatening in its indifference to religion, and a fourth part, still fairly strong, is steeped in the outward forms of worship and honours God with lips alone, imitating the works of the "Angel of the Church of Laodiceia"; both these last, the indifferent and the formalist, offer opportunities to the anti-Christians as they sow their tares. To neutralize the dangers of anti-Christianity and revivify the other fruitless parts of the people, what is needed is highly co-ordinated work on the part of the Church with a most broad and systematic participation by the lay element; this is more essential than ever in obviously difficult and critical times like our own.

FROM PLATONISM TO CHRISTIANITY

A critique of certain passages in V. Lossky's "Essai sur la Théologie Mystique de l'Église d'Orient," Aubier, Paris.

IN a book which I have found interesting, stimulating and valuable, there appears to me to be a tendency to over-emphasize the differences on the one hand between Eastern and Western theology, and on the other between Christian theology as a whole and the pagan philosophy of which it was, in many respects, a continuation. It is this latter tendency, which seems to belittle the value of Platonism as a *Præparatio Evangelica*, that has prompted me, with all the diffidence due to one who is neither a professional theologian nor a professional philosopher, to put forward, or rather restate, evidence for a continuous philosophical tradition bridging the gap between paganism and Christianity.

Professor Hilary Armstrong, in a recent article,[1] notes four basic differences which distinguish pagan Platonic from Christian teaching:—

1. The inaccessibility of the supreme object of contemplation.
2. The historicism of Christianity (the Incarnation).
3. The congregationalism of Christianity (the Church).
4. The ultimate salvation of the whole man, body as well as soul (the Resurrection).

These four features are the fruits of the Christian Revelation, which not only bestowed upon man a knowledge of God which no ratiocination could achieve and which was therefore "unto Greeks foolishness," but also, being connected with a physical event occurring in a given place at a given moment, linked together time and eternity, soul and body, and the community of redeemed mankind into the one Body of the Church. Paganism, of course, had to do without this Revelation, and therefore it could not be

[1] A. H. Armstrong, "The Return to Contemplation," *The Month*, September, 1949, pp. 175–181.

expected that these fruits should be found in it. They are unrelated to its philosophy, and though ultimately deriving from the same Source as that, entered the human consciousness by a different door.

In so far as mankind was prepared for the reception of these truths it was by the teachings of the prophets of the Old Testament. But there are certain other Christian doctrines, of a more philosophical order, to which the pagan philosophers seem to stand in the same relation of forerunners as the Hebrew prophets to the historical events of the Revelation. The most profound of these concern the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and it is here particularly that Professor Lossky seems to make absolute distinctions which, the foregoing considerations apart, are only relative.

Nobody would quarrel with Professor Lossky when he says (p. 48)[2] that the Neoplatonic Triad differs from the Christian Trinity in being hierarchic and emanational. Without this difference Christianity would be something other than it is.

"Fully thought out," writes A. E. Taylor in his essay on the Philosophy of Proclus,[3] "the conception of causation as a process of imaging, or, what is the same thing, the principle that there is always greater excellence in the cause than in its effect would have led Christian theologians who accepted Neoplatonism as their philosophic basis to an Arian doctrine of the Trinity: the Son, being 'the Image of the Father,' would have been 'inferior to the Father' not only 'as touching His manhood' but also 'as touching His Godhead'." But to say, as Professor Lossky does, that "this shows how false is the method of the historians who attempt to express the thought of the Fathers of the Church by interpreting the terms which they employ in the sense in which they are used in Hellenistic philosophy" seems too severe.

Eusebius sees in Numenius' doctrine of the Three Gods, Father, Son and Grandson, which lies at the basis of the Neoplatonic Triad, a revelation of the Holy Trinity,[4] and the earliest Christian doctrine of the Trinity was hierarchic. For Origen the Logos, instead of being the Principle of the One-Many, is Itself the One-Many. Between the world of the First God, absolutely transcendent, and that of the multiple creature, there must be an Intermediary. This Intermediary is the Logos, "intermediary between the generated and the Reality of all the generated."[5] "God (the Father) is God-in-Himself (αυτόθεος), as our Saviour says in His prayer: That they may acknowledge Thee the only true God. All that is outside God-in-Himself, since it acquires divinity by participation, should not be called ὁ θεός but θεός, and this is the name which belongs in the fullest sense to the Firstborn of every creature, first as being created at the right hand of God, drawing His divinity from Him, and superior in dignity to the other gods of whom God is the god."[6]

To this hierarchic order corresponds an order of progressive manifesta-

[2] All subsequent references, unless otherwise stated, are to *La Théologie Mystique de l'Église d'orient.*
[3] *Philosophical Studies* (1934), p. 175.
[4] Daniélou, *Origène*, pp. 102, 103.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 253, 254; Origen, c. Cels. 3. 34.
[6] Origen, *Comm. in Joann. ap. Daniélou, op. cit.*, pp. 250, 251.

tion. "The Patriarchs were not strangers to the faith and salvation of the Trinity," but "their faith was not total owing to the fact that in Christ the Economy of the Incarnation had not yet been accomplished."[7] In the same way, the Third Person is not fully revealed save in the establishment of the Church: "I believe that perhaps even with the coming of Jesus and His Incarnation we do not yet know the full achievement. Even when He is led to the Cross and is consummated in all things and is risen again from the dead, He does not Himself open to us all things as perfected. We have need of still another for complete revelation. Hear what the Saviour Himself says in the Gospel: 'I have still many things to say unto you but you cannot bear them now. The Spirit of Truth shall come, Who proceedeth from the Father. He shall receive of Me and shall teach you all things.' You observe that it is not only to Moses that the Number Three is not revealed in Its entirety, but that Jesus says again to His disciples: 'No one can understand if the Spirit does not come, because it is by Him and in Him that is accomplished the Perfection of the Trinity.'"

Although "the Platonist" Fathers were quick to abandon the hierarchy of hypostases as a satisfactory definition of the Holy Trinity, replacing it by a conception of the unique dependence of creatures upon God,[8] there is no evidence of an absolute break in the tradition. They would not have retained the Neoplatonic terminology without at least re-defining the terms if they considered that they were using them in a radically different sense. They were not rejecting the traditional doctrine, but taking it a step farther. They discovered, under the illumination of Revelation, that just as myth may be a metaphor for philosophical truth, so philosophical truth may be a metaphor for the ultimate Truth. Apophatically the Holy Trinity is neither Triad nor Hierarchy just as It is neither Monad nor Being: kataphatically It is all these things. It is triadic and hierarchic *eminenter* as being the Source of the triadic hierarchy discovered by philosophers to be the principle of order. This is the rejoinder to Arians who would argue along the lines suggested by A. E. Taylor in the passage quoted above: hierarchic distinction is predicated of God κατ' αἰτίαν in so far as He is the Source of all distinctions. We may, using this language, apply to Him terms similar to those in which we speak of the subordinate triads. Thus, St. John Damascene says,[9] "The Son is the Image of the Father, and the Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son."

The notion of the progressive manifestation of the Christian Revelation is taken over from Origen by St. Gregory Nazianzen.[10] "The Old Testament revealed the Father clearly, the Son obscurely. The New Testament revealed the Son and hinted at the divinity of the Spirit. To-day the Spirit lives amongst us and makes Himself better known. . . . By ascensions from glory to glory the splendour of the Trinity radiated forth progressively. . . . You see how the Light comes to us little by little. You see the order in which God reveals Himself to us. . . ." Can we not say that pagan

[7] Hom. Jos. 3, 2.
[8] Armstrong, "The Relevance of Plotinus," *Downside Review*, Spring, 1949, p. 124. Cf. *ibid.*, "The Return to Contemplation," p. 177.
[9] *De Fide Orthodoxa*, I, 13 (M.P.G. 94, 836).
[10] Or. 31 (*Theologica*, V), 26, 27 (M.P.G. 36, 161–164).

Platonism was also part of a progressive revelation, but starting from a different point? Scriptural revelation moves from the Divinity to the Trinity within the Divinity: pagan philosophy from the Trinity to the Divinity of the Trinity.

When we apply the Platonic terms kataphatically to the Holy Trinity, we discover other properties of the Neoplatonic Triad therein. It was an axiom of Proclus that "that which is first in every order preserves the form of the nature prior to itself." For the Neoplatonists every order was triadic. Consequently, in a sentence attributed to Plato, Proclus says: "A triad is the immediate progeny of a nomad, that is to say, the 'last' term of a superior triad is productive of the triad inferior to it. This principle accords with the action of the Holy Spirit, Who, communicating to human individuals within the Church the divinity which is common to Him and to the Father and to the Son (Lossky, p. 159), makes to shine forth mysteriously in them the One Nature of the Trinity." [11]

Just as we may regard the Plotinian Triad as a theophany of the Holy Trinity, so each hypostasis of it is a theophany of each of the Divine Hypostases. God the Father is One because He is the Source of Unity. When we contemplate the Trinity in Its aspect of Unity we contemplate the Father, as in the Old Testament. God the Son is Nous because He is the Principle of Nous: "In the mysterious life of the Blessed Trinity the Word is truly Intellect and the only Place of the creative Forms, the *similitudines expressivæ*, but He is so *eminenter*, in a way transcending our thought, because His infinite plenitude is absolutely simple. There is in Him no distinction of being and thought . . . and the Forms in Him are one thing, His infinite being, and not the unity-in-diversity which Plotinus describes and as which we must necessarily think them." [12] That is to say, He is not the One-Many, but the Principle of the One-Many: One (speaking again kataphatically) in His Incarnation in one human body, Many as the Anakephalaiosis of Mankind in the Earthly Paradise before the Fall and as it is being restored since the Redemption in the Church, which is itself a theophany of God as the One-Many, for "it is neither barbarian nor Jew nor Greek nor man nor woman, but the New Man in his totality." [13] "One in Christ, the Church, this new body of humanity, comprises a multitude of human hypostases" (Lossky, p. 162). Again, "the first great Christian theologians who use Plotinus, St. Basil and Gregory of Nyssa in the East and St. Augustine in the West, apply . . . much of what he says about Soul to the activity of the Holy Spirit in creation." [14] God the Holy Spirit is Soul as being the Principle of Soul, the Lord and Giver of Life: and Multiplicity is His theophany. The Holy Spirit is the recipient of all the multiplicity of names which may be applied to the Grace of God of which He is the distributor. Just as the operation of the Son relates to human nature as it is recapitulated in His Hypostasis, so the operation of the Holy Spirit relates to the individuals which that nature comprises, addressing Himself to each severally. The Holy Spirit communicates the

[11] Fourth Tone of Sunday (cf. Lossky).
[12] Armstrong, *Relevance of Plotinus*, p. 125.
[13] St. Clement of Alexandria, Protrept. 11 (M.P.G. 8 229B).
[14] Armstrong, *Relevance of Plotinus*, p. 125.

Divine Pleroma, in the Church, to the human hypostases according to a mode which is unique for each, a "personal" communication appropriate to each individual in so far as he is a person created in the Image of God. "*La multitude des saints sera son image*" (Lossky, pp. 162, 163, 169).

It has been my purpose to show, by illustrating the way in which the Early Fathers thought of the relations between the Persons of the Trinity, how smoothly Neoplatonist doctrine passed into Christian dogma; and to infer from the fact that it was permitted to do so that the former was not regarded as wholly erroneous. It is even conceivable that the pagan tradition might, without the aid of Revelation, have attained the conception of a divine Triad-in-Monad, at least so far as to get beyond the principle δύο τέλεια ἓν γένεσθαι οὐ δύναται, which was the chief stumbling-block in arriving during the first Christian centuries at a proper understanding of the Two Natures of Christ. What it could never, of course, have attained was the Personality of the Hypostases: the human mind unaided could never have reached beyond Το ὄν of Hellenistic philosophy to ὁ ὤν of Byzantine iconography.

I. P. Sheldon-Williams,
Kathara Deftera 1950

THE PRESBYTERA

A "Just-so" Story of Ecclesiastical History

[From a Correspondent]

(The author apologizes for scientific errors in this tale. It is true that all these controversies did not start at the same time. But it is important to realize that the separation of East and West came about somewhat gradually and, to a great extent, through parochial conflicts of this kind.)

"FR. DOMINIC," said Bishop Théophilos, "you must not call Fr. Demetrius and his family by such names as 'Nicolaitanes.' I will not have it in this diocese. It may be all right where you come from. I have no jurisdiction there. I simply can't see what you Italian chaplains are coming to. The last but three was a married man. But you and Fr. Peter seem to think you are so much holier than all the other parish priests of this diocese, just because you have no wives. I have overlooked some of the things you have been reported to be saying, far too long. I will not tolerate insulting language about your brother clergy, who are living in full accord with local canon law, which is more than you are doing, I can tell you." Fr. Dominic was a new arrival in a Greek city where there was an Italian parish. He had been told, before he left home, that the Greek customs were not quite the same as the customs of his own country and that, while it was his duty to keep the Italians faithful to good ways as far as possible, he was to be subject to the bishop of the place and to obey him, in all things lawful and honest, even adapting himself to local customs to some extent. But he did not remember being told that he was to abate in any way his preaching of the wickedness of the marriage of the ministers of the altar. In his home country it was the burning question of the hour. All married men who were ordained had to see to the maintenance of their wives in

fairly well and could, as a good priest's wife, make inquiries about their daughter's spiritual state. She was not surprised to find that the young woman in question went to church less often than she should. But she was outwardly horrified to learn the reason. In her husband's Italian Church the baby could not make his communion. Therefore there was no reason to go regularly with the baby, as the Greek young wives generally do. "Why can't the baby have communion? Hasn't he been baptized?" The reply was that the child had, in fact, been baptized and chrismated by a Greek priest and had had his first communion then, but the Latin clergy both said that it was not their custom to give communion to infants and argued that the baby had not been confirmed by a bishop. Mrs. Demetrius fumed. "Must the poor bishop go to every baptism in the diocese, then, so as to satisfy these strangers?" She then laid a trap for the unwary Latins by persuading the mother of the young woman to go with her daughter to the Latin Church one Sunday and to take an offering of good sound Greek Church bread. The Latins refused to accept it, saying that it would be sinful for them to offer or to consecrate this "profane" bread with leaven in it. Mrs. Demetrius prepared to go to the bishop about it. But her husband checked her and wanted to give Fr. Dominic an opportunity to explain himself. He was all for inviting the Latin priest to a meal. "But, my dear, it is almost the carnival week. We can't invite him before cheese-week now." He came and, looking at the cheese and eggs with some disgust, began to complain of the cruelty of the locality to the poor Latins. No shop had any meat, although, from the Latin point of view, it was not Lent yet. But he had heard that, as soon as Lent came, every bit of everything animal would be unobtainable except at the most terrible prices on the black market. "Your system of fasting is all wrong," he declared. Fr. Demetrius tried to be conciliatory, but soon they reached the topic of fasting on Saturdays. The Greeks, on Saturdays and Sundays (apart from the Great Saturday) and on certain saints' days in Lent, can eat fish. Otherwise they keep entirely to vegetable foods until Easter. Nothing which is not "fast-food" can be got in any shop. "Saturday is as much a fast as Friday," declared Fr. Dominic. "By the way," he added, "why may I not celebrate the Eucharist in Lent, in this diocese of yours, on any days except Saturdays and Sundays, Maundy Thursday and the chief saints' days?" Fr. Demetrius took down his book of the Sacred Canons and pointed out various canons of the Sixth Œcumenical Council. Certain of these canons explicitly said that the practice of the Church of the Elder Rome was wrong and must be corrected. Fr. Dominic was startled. Had he been sent to a community of schismatics and heretics by mistake? "You seem to think," he said, "that you in the East have the only true religion," and he left the house very sorrowfully.

The bishop was puzzled at his next interview with Fr. Dominic. He was most anxious to explain to the young priest that, as far as he was concerned, Roman customs were quite all right in Rome, unless one or two of them were really wrong in principle, and on that subject he was not expert. But the main point, for him, was that there must be peace and quiet in his diocese, and the Greek women certainly had a grievance over the things said about their offerings of bread, and their cooking, and their fasting, and

their babies' communions, not to mention their priests' wives. "If I have any more complaints," he said, "I shall order that you grow a beard." He found and studied a Greek translation of the Liturgy of St. Peter. He came to the Latin Church and celebrated there in Greek. But he felt very uncomfortable about the curious festivities which he was asked to watch after the service; little children dressed up as saints. People knelt to kiss his hand. The "ikons" looked so curious. He wished he had never looked into the matter. Finally he wrote to Constantinople and was instructed to give strict orders that the Latins should not fast on Saturdays except on the Great Saturday, that they should use leavened bread, that they should confirm with the proper chrism all infants baptized, and that they should give an undertaking not to say the *"Filioque"* clause, and so on and so forth. He gave the order. The Latins disobeyed it flagrantly and called him schismatic. He closed their church. They had it reopened by imperial orders, but as a tolerated building in their own quarter of the town in which they lived, apart from all Orthodox Christians, like Jews or any sect.

This was going on not only in Constantinople, where there were always some Latin parishes, and where, as late as 1120, some of them seem to have been under the Patriarch's jurisdiction, but in Greek cities in Greece and in Southern Italy and in Eastern lands like Palestine, through the early middle ages. As late as the thirteenth century in Dalmatia and elsewhere there were "azymite" priests ordained by Greek Orthodox bishops and therefore, one presumes, under their jurisdiction, and Latins who invited the local bishop of the Greeks to visit them and worship with them. His action in doing so may have been, in a broad sense, a matter of "Economy"; but it seems unproved that he by any means regarded them as schismatics, unless they regarded him as a schismatic and had their own Latin bishop, as they had in the Latin Empire and in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and the other Latin States. The Latins under Byzantine rulers, like some of the Greeks under Latin rulers, were far away from home and so far from seeing as yet the finality of the division of East and West that their first inclination was to accept the bishop of the place as the bishop of all Catholics there if he would accept them as Catholics. But the difference between the Latin bishop attempting to rule over Greeks and the Greek bishop attempting to rule over Latins was that, as the medieval Greeks often noticed in their treatises, "the Latins do not know con-celebration." Theoretically it was known; but in practice, broadly speaking, each priest said his own mass. This facilitated the separation, in one diocese, of the Latins proper from the "Latin-minded Greeks," who had the Greek rite but were obedient to the Latin ordinary or had a suffragan bishop of their own rite. On the Greek side, on the other hand, con-celebration favoured Byzantinization and such liturgical "hybrids" as the Greek "Liturgy of St. Peter," a mixture of the Roman rite in Greek with Greek litanies and prayers. It brought about insistence on leavened bread, not necessarily and universally because the curious contentions against the "azymites" were all accepted, but because of the unity of the diocese. It was a liturgical unity, rather than a unity of obedience. This seems to be part at least of the manner of the tragic schism.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TRAVELLER IN GREECE [1]

SETTING out the next day we came to Kymurgina,[2] which is a small and very ancient town, where the ruins of a great castle remain to this day. Five leagues distant we found another town, the walls of which exist in their entirety, apart from the breaches which were made when the town was taken. We had no sooner entered than the inhabitants came out from their houses to gaze at us and to examine us with as much curiosity as we ourselves had in beholding their town. Observing that the greater number were Christians, I besought them to show me the church. This they did willingly enough, and I saw with sorrow that this church, which had been at one time one of the most beautiful in the whole of Greece, was falling into ruin for lack of repair. A good woman, observing my sorrow on this account, signed to me to follow and brought me to another church which she showed me with tears in her eyes, for it was in a far more deplorable state than was the first, testifying the meanwhile by her motions and by her sighs that these ruins were the sensible token of their great misery.

I regarded this church with attention. It was smaller than the other which I had just beheld but it was easy to see that it had been incomparably richer and more beautiful. I remarked that it had been dedicated to the Holy Virgin, whose icon still remained although there were no longer the means for saying Mass, for not only was the altar ruined but the whole church was filled with marble columns and pilasters, these fragments bearing witness to the greatness of the desolation of this poor country. I also discerned on the walls the remains of paintings and of fillets of gold which showed clearly that in other days this church had been well adorned. In all the town there was but one poor priest who told me that he had great difficulty in keeping himself alive, for this unfortunate people had been entirely ruined: not only by the Turks but also by the corsairs who often raided the district. This town, which is called Peritory,[3] is so ancient that we were assured that more than 2,000 years have passed since it was built.

We came, two days later, to Cavallos,[4] which is a town the more remarkable in that it was built by Alexander the Great on account of his horse Bucephalus. It is situated on an eminence which projects into the sea and, towards midday, commands a view of Mount Athos, otherwise known as the Holy Mountain, perhaps because it is inhabited by a great number of the monks of Saint Basil, who dwell there in great austerity. This mountain is that on which a sculptor proposed to Alexander to make a statue which should represent him bearing a town in one hand and, with the other, pouring a river into the sea. This town is fortified with walls which are in good repair and where a good watch is always kept. There is, moreover, a

[1] A translation of two extracts from the "Voyage en Turquie et en Grèce du R. P. Robert de Dreux, Capucin de S. Jaques à Paris et Aumonier de l'Ambassadeur de France, 1665–1669." The French text was first published in its entirety by M. Hubert Pernot in 1925 from the manuscript in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris.

[2] The modern Komotini.

[3] Père Robert is perfectly correct in describing this town as peritory (Περιδώρι). Pernot seems to have had difficulty in identifying it, however, and surmises that the author may have confused it with the neighbouring town of Maroneia, though, as he admits, P. Robert would if this were so have had to make a *crochet* in order to visit Komotini.

[4] An error on the part of P. Robert or his copyist. The name should of course be Cavalla.

castle consisting of two outworks and a great tower which is built on the heights.

A little way from Cavallos there is a mountain wholly of rocks among which there descends a stream the waters of which are admirably clear. It has been caused to flow into the town itself by means of an aqueduct, and from this quarter may be seen the ruins of a mighty wall which, descending as it does from the mountain even to the town, protects the remnant of the country against surprise attack.

This town is divided into two by a wall which thus creates an upper town and a lower. At the entrance to the latter I was shown a fair tomb of white marble, which now serves as a reservoir for water. I found there this epitaph: *Cornelia P. fil. Asprilia sac. divæ Aug. ann. xxxv H.S.E.* Some Turks, seeing me writing down this epitaph, signed to me to follow them to see two other, and very similar, tombs where I found these two further inscriptions: *P. Cornelius Asper Atriarius Montanus, equo publico honoratus, item ornamentis decurionatus et II uiralicis Pontifex flamen diui Claudi Philippis ann. xxiii H.S.E.* Connoisseurs who apply themselves to the study of medals and of ancient honorific titles will be able to explain the meaning of these epitaphs better than I. In this same town, too, I was taken to see the burial of a Turk, who was laid out without a turban but with only a large chaplet which was at least three ells in length. I was told that it was one of their religious who had acquired a great reputation.

Having left Cavallos we came after three days to the town of Seres, which is very fair and very large. It lies in a pleasant valley, and on a mountain close at hand there is a fortress. It seemed that art and nature had competed to fortify this place which is virtually inaccessible from one side and, on the other, is defended by a triple wall and several bastions. This fortification encloses a great square in the midst of which lie four cisterns, perfectly constructed but now without water, having been broken asunder in many places like the walls of the fortress, for it is the policy of the Turks to leave no stronghold save on their frontiers, that no place of retreat may be left to those who would rise against them.

Close to this fortress we found the ruins of two chapels which still retained a few traces of their ancient beauty. What seemed to me much more notable, however, in this town of Seres is the fact that there stands in the midst of the town a great belfry in the form of a square tower in which there is a mighty bell which sounds the hours in the French manner. This is all the more astonishing since throughout all Turkey a public clock is never found and, furthermore, the Turks reckon the hours not as we do but in the manner of the Italians, who commence to count the first hour from sunset in such a way that they push forward or draw back their first hour as the sun sinks earlier or later.

I learned that it was some great lord who had forbidden the use of public clocks, and that the inhabitants of certain conquered towns having entreated him most humbly that he would leave them at least a clock, he demanded what use they purposed to make of it. They replied that it was that they might the better know the times of their prayers, of drinking, of eating, of rising from their beds and of going to rest. He answered that it was needful to pray to God at all times; the day informed us when it was

time to rise, the night when it was time to go to bed, hunger and thirst when we should eat and drink, without any necessity of being warned by a clock. This prohibition of public bells and clocks is so nicely observed in all Turkey that in the four years I have dwelt there and in all the travels I have undertaken, covering as many as 300 leagues of this country, I have seen no other clock than that at Seres.[5] This I admired so much that hearing the bell, which is so large that it can be heard all over the town, I enquired from whence it could have come, but I could ascertain nothing beyond the fact that from time immemorial the clock had struck in this fashion.

At Larissa we were staying close to the cathedral, which circumstance afforded me the opportunity of going one day to hear the Mass which the Archbishop was celebrating. The latter, having seen me in the choir, ordered his dragoman to join me when I left the church and to conduct me to his residence. The dragoman did not fail to do so, and he had hardly brought me into the chamber of the Archbishop when the latter arrived and, after many embraces, said that he was astonished that I should have lived near him for so long without having been to see him before. I excused myself on account of the difficulty which I had in speaking Greek. He replied that this should not deprive him of the solace of our company since he had dragomans who could assist us in our conversation, which circumstance induced me to promise to visit him in future, since he greatly desired to endure my importunity. At the same time he invited me to assist the next day, it being Good Friday, at his Mass, which he would celebrate with greater ceremony. I did not fail to attend, together with one of our gentlemen, and we were placed in the first stalls of the choir.

When the Archbishop was vested in his pontifical attire he first gave an address which lasted half an hour and then, accompanied by nine bishops (his suffragans), he made a procession about the church, bearing in his hands the chalice covered by a veil which hung from his head, and all the people, as he passed, made the sign of the cross incessantly as well as great prostrations. This fact causing me to suspect that he bore the Holy Sacrament I knelt towards the altar. The gentleman who was with me, however, not believing that it was the Holy Sacrament that he bore, remained firmly in his stall without prostrating himself: a circumstance which surprised the Archbishop, as he afterwards informed me. We remained in church until the end of all their ceremonies which lasted more than three hours.

It is not easy to observe all that they do in saying Mass because the celebrant is hidden by a screen[6] which shuts off the altar, only appearing three or four times. When the elevation of the host is reached the priest turns towards the people displaying the Holy Sacrament at the door of the screen, and the people without kneeling down make abundant signs of the cross and profound bows. To give communion to those who desire it the priest again presents himself at the door of the screen, holding in his left hand the chalice wherein the species of bread and wine are mingled, for

[5] One of the more regrettable consequences of the liberation was a wave of tower-building. The *plateia* or 'place' of many otherwise attractive towns of Macedonia and Thrace is now dominated by a monstrous specimen of this type of architectural aberration. The towers at Kozani and at Xanthi are particularly notable.

[6] *Un balustre.*

every one communicates under the two species, and in his right hand he holds a small silver spoon with which he gives simultaneously the body and blood of our Lord to those who present themselves, making only a genuflexion as if they were going to the offering, at the said door.

When the Mass was ended I was conducted, together with our gentleman, to the Archbishop's house where he came to meet us and besought us to eat with him, for which invitation I thanked him, taking only a little coffee which he caused to be presented to us after it had been sprinkled with the essence of jasmine. When I sought to take leave of him he asked if the gentleman who was with me were not a Catholic. I answered in the affirmative and he replied: "How comes it then that he did not prostrate himself when I passed before him bearing in my hands the most Holy Sacrament?" The gentleman, hearing this, excused himself on the grounds that he had not supposed that the consecration had already taken place, and though he saw the people prostrating themselves this had not reassured him, since he had already remarked at other Masses that the Greek people prostrate themselves in this fashion as soon as the offering is made. When the Archbishop heard this he said that the Mass which he had just celebrated was only for the ceremonies, and he had not consecrated because on Palm Sunday he consecrated as many hosts as would be needed for Holy Week, during which they never consecrated. Which explanation confirmed me in the belief which I had already formed, that the Greeks maintain the reality of the precious body of Jesus Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the altar, since they reserve the consecrated hosts in this way.

Cavalla, 9 ix 49. PETER HAMMOND.

CONFESSION OF FAITH OF AN ORTHODOX BISHOP AT HIS CONSECRATION

ONE is frequently asked, what kind of profession of Faith, to correspond, say, to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, is required of Orthodox clergy. Actually, the only form of standard confession beyond the Baptismal Creed is that found in the Libelli of the Orthodox Faith which a candidate for the Episcopate is required to read as his profession of Faith before his consecration. It seemed therefore to the point to publish a translation of these as they are to be found in the Greek Euchology—the Russian form is actually somewhat different. We give the questions and answers without the rubrics, which would require explanation.

Consecrating Bishop: What hast thou come here asking from us?

Candidate: Ordination to the Archieratic grace, the clergy of the most holy Bishopric (of X) having elected me.

Bishop: And what dost thou believe?

Candidate: I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father; by Whom all things were made: Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and

was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried: and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father: and He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: Whose Kingdom shall have no end: And in the Holy Ghost the Lord the Life-Giver, Who proceedeth from the Father; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; Who spake by the Prophets: in one holy catholic and apostolic Church: I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins: I look for the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the world to come, Amen.

Bishop: The grace of the Holy Ghost be with thee.

Second Bishop: Declare to us more fully how thou confessest also concerning the particularities (ἰδιότης) of the three persons (hypostases) of the incomprehensible Trinity.

Candidate: I believe in one God in three persons *(prosopa)* distributed, I mean Father and Son and Holy Ghost: distributed I say in matter of particularity, but undistributed in essence, and the same all Trinity, and the same all Unity: Unity in essence and nature and form; Trinity in particularity and nomenclature: for the one is named Father, the other Son, and the other Holy Ghost: the Father unbegotten and unoriginate; for there is nothing elder than He: for He was, and certainly He was God: and unoriginate; for He has His Being from nothing save from Himself. And I believe that the Father is the cause of the Son and of the Spirit; but of the Son by begetting, and of the Holy Ghost by procession; no separation or alienation being intended by these terms, but only the difference of the hypostatic properties *(idiomata)*; that the Father begets the Son, and projects the Holy Ghost; and the Son is begotten from the Father alone; and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. And so I maintain one beginning (ἀρχή) and recognize one cause, the Father, of Son and Spirit: and I call the Son Beginning above time and unlimited; not as Beginning of the creatures, as if He were the first-created, bearing precedence among these —God forbid—for this is an absurdity of Arian impiety: for that man of evil name blasphemed as creature the Son and the Holy Ghost. But I call the Son Beginning as being from the Unoriginate, that two Beginnings be not received; and with the Beginning in respect of the Son (μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ) the Holy Ghost, since both simultaneously and together they have their being from the Father, both the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Son by begetting, the Holy Ghost by procession, as has been said. And neither is the Father divided from the Son, nor the Son from the Holy Ghost, nor the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; but the Father is all in the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the Son all in the Father and the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost all in the Father and the Son: for they are united dividedly and divided unitedly. And I confess that the Word of God, co-eternal with the Father, the super-temporal, the incomprehensible, the infinite, comes down to our nature, and takes man in his humiliation, complete in his fallen state (ἄνθρωπον τεταπεινωμένον καὶ ὅλον τὸν περιπεπτωκότα) from the chaste and virgin bloods of the only all-spotless and pure Virgin, that He may bestow on all the world salvation and grace, for His own great compassion; and there is come to pass the

hypostatic union of the natures; not that the babe was completed by the gradual additions; nor that the combined natures were united in the way of compounding or confusion or mingling; nor that the man was substantiate, and the Word added, and the union relative (σχετική), according to the God-hateful and Jew-minded Nestorius, nor that He was without mind and without soul, according to the truly mindless Apollinarius—for he babbled that the Godhead sufficed instead of the mind: but I confess Him perfect God and perfect Man the same, Who is simultaneously flesh and Word of God; flesh animated with a rational soul and mind; and He preserves all the natural glories of His Godhead even after the union, and does not change the properties of His Godhead or of His Manhood because of its absolute conjunction with the Word, but Himself bears one combined (σύνθετον) hypostasis, preserving two natures and operations, from which and in which He was the same One Jesus Christ our God: and He has two Wills—two in nature, not in purpose (φυσικὰς οὐ γνωμικὰς). And it is to be known that He suffered, I say, as God in the flesh; but not that the Godhead was passible, or suffered in the flesh. Further I confess that He took all our unexceptionable passions, which are concomitant with our nature apart from sin, like hunger, thirst, weariness, tears, and such like, but that they operated in him not perforce as they do in us, but as His human Will followed His divine Will: for willingly He hungered, willingly thirsted, willingly was weary, willingly died. And He dies, accepting death for our sakes, while His Godhead remains impassible—for He Himself was not subject to death, He who taketh away the sin of the world—but that He might bring us all out from the all-consuming hand of death, and by His own blood bring us to His own Father: and death attacking a human body, is overthrown by the power of the Godhead, and the souls of the righteous in chains since the beginning of the world are led up from thence. And after He rose from the dead, He appeared for forty days on earth with the Disciples, and was taken up to Heaven, and sat on the right hand of the Father. And by right hand of the Father I mean not something spatial or circumscribed; but I say that the right hand of God is the unoriginate and pre-eternal glory which the Son had before He became man, and had it after He became man: for His holy flesh is worshipped together with His Godhead in worthy worship; not that the Holy Trinity receives an addition —God forbid!—for the Trinity remains Trinity even after the union of the Only-begotten, when His holy flesh remained inseparable, and will still remain with Him even to eternity: for with it He shall come to judge the quick and the dead, both righteous and sinners, and will repay the righteous their works of virtue, and the Kingdom of Heaven for which they toiled here; but will requite the sinners with eternal torment, and the unending fire of hell; the experience of which God grant we all may escape, and obtain the pure blessings promised in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

Bishop: The grace of the Holy Ghost be with thee, to enlighten thee, stablish thee, and give thee understanding all the days of thy life.

Third Bishop: Declare to us still more fully, how thou confessest also what concerns the becoming man of the hypostatic Son and Word of God, and how many natures thou proclaimest (δογματίζεις) in the same One Christ our God.

Candidate: I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: unoriginate and unbegotten and without cause: but natural Beginning and Cause of Son and Spirit. And I believe in His Only-begotten Son, begotten of Him without flux and timelessly, of one substance with Him; by Whom all things were made. I believe also in the Holy Ghost, which proceedeth from the Father Himself, and is glorified with Him, as co-eternal and of one throne and substance and glory, and artificer *(demiurge)* of the creation. I believe that the One of the same super-essential Trinity which is the source of Life, the only-begotten Son, came down from heaven for us men and for our salvation, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man—that is, became perfect man, while He remained God, and did not change anything of His Divine Essence for His communion with the flesh, nor alter anything; but without change assumed Man, and in him endured the Passion and the Cross, while free from every passion in His Divine Nature: and He rose the third day from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God the Father. I believe also the traditions and interpretations about God and things Divine of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins: I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the Life of the World to come. Further I acknowledge one hypostasis of the Word made man. And I believe and preach one and the same Christ in two Willings (θελήσεσι) and Natures after He was made man, preserving all of that in which, and that from whence He was. And consequently I maintain also two Wills (θελήματα), each Nature preserving its own Will and its own Operation. I am a worshipper (relatively, and not by adoration) of the divine and venerable images, both of Christ Himself, and of the All-Pure Mother of God, and of all the Saints: and I transmit the honour paid to them to their originals. And those who think in any other way than this I reject as of alien mind. I anathematize Arius, and those who were of one mind with him, and partakers of his maniac cacodoxy; Macedonius and his company, who were well named Spirit-fighters: likewise Nestorius and the rest of the heresiarchs, and those who were of the same mind with them, I reject and anathematize: and I proclaim clearly with loud voice: Anathema to all the heretics: Anathema to the whole body of heretics! And I acknowledge and preach our Lady the God-Bearer Mary rightly and truly, as having given birth in the flesh to Him Who is One of the Trinity, Christ our God. And may She be my aid and protection and succour all the days of my life. Amen.

Bishop: The grace of the Holy Ghost by my mediocrity prefers thee the most God-loving priest candidate *N.* for bishop of the God-preserved city of X.

NOTES ON SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS

IN *Ekklesia,* Professor Trembelas, the professor of the Liturgy in the theological faculty of the University of Athens, has been writing some extremely interesting articles on the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church in France, with a side-glance, here and there, at Dom Gregory Dix's book on *The Shape of the Liturgy.* He sees in the whole

movement a return to the common liturgical heritage of East and West which must inevitably increase Western interest in Eastern Orthodoxy. In one of the latest articles he points out that the Ikonostasis, as we now know it, is late, and that the practice of frequent communion was far from unknown in medieval Byzantium. He has been urging that many of the liturgical prayers now said silently by the priest in the Eastern liturgy were formerly said aloud and can rightly be said aloud; indeed this is done in a fair number of churches in Greece at the present time. He has also stressed the great liturgical and doctrinal significance of the practice of con-celebration, in which several priests join in the priestly action of one liturgy and communicate together. In the correspondence columns of *Ekklesia*, reference has been made to a law of the Emperor Justinian commanding that priests should say the prayers of the liturgy audibly and not, as they were then beginning to do, silently.

In the last few years there have been a certain number of articles and letters in *Ekklesia* dealing with the practice of kneeling in the time of the Sunday liturgy and during the season between Easter and Pentecost. The ancient canons, including those of Nicæa, command the people to stand for worship, in memory of the Resurrection, and this has never been by any means a dead letter in the Eastern tradition. But for one reason or another it has become the custom of some of the people to kneel upon both knees in prayer during the most solemn moment of the consecration prayer, while the Epiklesis is said, to greet the Saviour's presence. They do not omit this on Sundays and in the Easter season, although some think that they should do so. It is curious that many Anglicans should have got hold of the idea that in the Eastern Church, in our own days, no "moment of consecration" is recognized when, whether every one kneels or not, in any Greek Church one can see and feel the sudden concentration of attention as the choir sings the slow chant which accompanies the Epiklesis. But of course there are also acts of worship during the Great Entrance, as the gifts of the people are carried from the Credence to the altar through the Church.

In *Theologia* for 1949, the first number contains an extremely interesting and important article by Professor Alivizatos, the Professor of Canon Law in the theological faculty of the University of Athens, and an active participant in the activities of the World Council of Churches. His subject is "Contemporary Theological Tendencies in Greek Orthodoxy." The article is not easy to summarize but is extremely important in its emphasis on the significance of the return to Patristic theology and the discovery of the real meaning of the "lack of definition" which is so often the subject of Western comment on Orthodox thought. Documents dealing with the Amsterdam Conference appear in a translation by the Metropolitan Germanos of Thyateira, who also contributes a most important review of Professor Dvornik's book on *The Photian Schism*. A posthumous work of the late Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos, on the external condition of the Church of Constantinople after the Turkish occupation began, is published in a serial form.

The subject of the relations of the Orthodox Church with the Œcumenical Movement has been the subject of articles both in *Ekklesia* and in *Theologia*, as well as in *Gregorios Palamas*, the periodical published in

Salonika and ably edited by Professor B. Joannides, the professor of the New Testament in the theological faculty of the University of Thessalonika. Another professor of that faculty, who was at Amsterdam, Professor G. I. Konidares, of ecclesiastical history, has written important articles on the subject in *Theologia*. Possibly even more were the articles of Professor Karmiris in *Ekklesia*, even if only because they contain part of a report he made officially to the Greek Holy Synod, in his capacity as professor of the history of dogma and acting professor of dogmatics in the theological faculty of the University of Athens. What seems to have come upon many people almost as a new discovery at the time of Amsterdam is the idea that the World Council of Churches, unlike the less formally instituted movements of the inter-war period, is to have Churches as members. The Church is not merely to allow individuals to take some part in it on their own responsibility, while remembering their loyalty to her; she is to assume definite responsibilities of some kind for the existence of the various central organs of the World Council, which deal with all kinds of subjects, including the arrangement of discussions on questions of Faith and Order as well as the arrangement of matters of practical co-operation. This is a new idea, with a new name. The difficulty is to understand exactly how much or how little it may imply. But it will be interesting to see the effect on the Greek Orthodox reaction to these matters of the recent moves in the Vatican. Every one wants to co-operate in the practical field and every one discusses dogmatic issues, if only to debate whether they should be discussed.

Among the publications of the "Damascus" publishing house, which is supported by the "Aktines" circle and the "Greek Union of Christian Professional men," we notice a second edition of Fr. Kotzones' translation of Professor Holzner's life of St. Paul and a translation of *Murder in the Cathedral*.

Orthodoxia, the official organ of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, draws attention to the formation of a "Brotherhood of the Holy Apostle Andrew" with the aim of binding together individuals, parishes and religious societies in the sphere of the dispersed jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Throne, in a common effort for the support of the Church and her work. There is an interesting article on the Jubilee of the Old Catholic Bishop in Switzerland and a note on the Roman Catholic *rapprochement* with the Anglican Communion, a subject to which *Ekklesia* also draws attention, in a very friendly tone, towards both communions, while difficulties are recognized.

CORRESPONDENCE

IN view of certain criticisms which have been made of my summary, "The Years Between" in the last number of *The Christian East*, it seems right to make some explanations.

(a) On page 14 I spoke of "criticism, in Greece, Serbia, and elsewhere, of tendencies to amalgamate 'Faith and Order' with 'Life and Work' in ways which might threaten the rightful primacy of 'Faith and Order'." By "primacy" I meant of course primacy of importance, not priority in order of discussion. I was fully aware that one way of asserting that primacy was to object to any inclusion of "Faith and Order" in the same programme as "Life and Work."

(b) In asserting, on page 12, that criticism of the Moscow Patriarchate "seems commonly to come from Roman Catholic sources, or from other elements which see no solution but war," I should perhaps have made it clear that some of these other elements are to be found within the Orthodox Churches. Again, in referring on page 13, to the Archimandrite Parthenius' pointing out "that the Roman crusade against Communism *is not* the Orthodox way of resistance," I should rather have written "*may not be.*" In both cases, my purpose was to voice a caveat, and no more—I was concerned to plead in defence of the other way, not to attack the Roman Church at a time when, whatever our differences, real or apparent, in policy, we are seeking to fight the same battle.

(c) In regard to the Rumanian discussions—we may admit (though one may deplore the fact) that it was inevitable that any decisions of our Convocations in 1936 should be equivocal. Canon Douglas, who was secretary-correspondent of the Anglican Delegation, assures me that the resolution adopted by the Canterbury and York Convocation approving the Anglican statements as "a legitimate interpretation" of Anglican tradition, had been suggested by the Rumanian theologians with whom the Anglican delegation conferred in 1935: and also that in 1937 the Patriarch Miron Cristea formally notified Archbishop Lang of Canterbury that in consequence of those resolutions his Synod had declared its acceptance of Anglican ordinations. My footnote on page 7, which might itself have been more explicit, was in fact intended to indicate that I knew at least something of the effectiveness of this in the generous degree of "economy" exercised towards us. It is greatly to be hoped that all the relevant documents may soon be published in full.

I would not have my words on page 14 taken as disparagement of the great and permanent value of work then done. I do not believe that the Moscow pronouncements have overthrown the essence of that work. Nevertheless I cannot retreat from my welcome of the new stage in our relationships. For, while I know we must be very patient and very humble, I do believe that full and explicit dogmatic agreement with the Orthodox Church, expressed in worship and in life, is both ultimately achieveable for us, and the only legitimate goal of work for unity. And I cherish the belief that, when found, it will point the way to a unity among Western Christians of a kind hitherto undreamt of.

DERWAS J. CHITTY.

REVIEW

ECONOMY, ACCORDING TO THE CANON LAW OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Professor Hamilkar S. Alivizatos, D.D., Athens, "Ἀστήρ" Press, 1949.

I greatly regret that I had not this book in hand when I wrote the article, "Ecclesia extra ecclesiam," which appeared in the last number of this periodical.

It deals with the idea of "Economy" in an extremely broad and comprehensive way and not merely with the particular aspect of "Economy" which has attracted the attention of those who work for the re-union of the

Churches. But all who know the great work which Professor Alivizatos has done for the Œcumenical Movement, in all its aspects, will regard what he says as extremely important, from that point of view.

The first point emphasized is that the ecclesiastical authorities—that is to say—primarily the bishops—exercise "Economy" not by acting as private individuals according to their own personal ideas but by the use of their sacerdotal authority given to them by God and by acting in the name of the whole Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. The whole conception pre-supposes the divine origin of the episcopal authority and the continued guidance of the Church and of each regularly constituted part of the Church by the Holy Spirit of God. Although Professor Alivizatos does not refer to the particular example of the Council of Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv., it comes at once to mind as the great original act of "Economy." "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." The ecclesiastical authorities speak for the Church, believing that the Holy Ghost, in His guiding of the Church, is guiding them. As the Church in her admission of the Gentiles insisted on faith working through love, on right belief and on the avoidance of actions which would scandalize the faithful or would be inconsistent with faith, so she still does. As she permitted what then seemed irregularity in matters of practice to the Jews among her members, who were then her only members, to gain the Gentile world, so she may now permit, and she always has permitted from time to time, "certain uncanonical solutions, departing from strictness and seemingly abnormal in consequence, but nevertheless indisputably saving the stability of the faithful and of the holy churches of God," and these departures are called by the name of "Economy" or "Condescension" or "Clemency." Dogma must not be affected. This does not mean that there can be nothing of the nature of "Economy" connected with the actual intellectual formulation of dogma. In the Orthodox Church, as contrasted with the Post-Tridentine Roman Catholic Church, much is left undefined, and "dogmatic teaching" is to a great extent the teaching of individual theologians on matters about which there is no dogma either defined in an Œcumenical Council or settled, as it were, in the conscience of the Church by long and universal acceptance. There may in fact, even in the field of belief, be standards of the interpretation of the faith which ecclesiastical authorities are guided by the Holy Spirit to treat as authoritative in some circumstances but not in all circumstances. Professor Alivizatos means that these are true, otherwise they could not be the authoritative teaching of the Church. The discovery that any formulation was wrong is, for theologians of all confessions, the discovery that the true Church has not decided in favour of it and that it is not the teaching of the Church throughout the ages. But something may seem to be the teaching of the Church and may be, under divine guidance, taught until more is known. All teaching given by the Church is given under the guidance of God. All strictness and all "Economy" are under the guidance of God. God is not bound. Therefore there is no limit to them. We cannot say what God will never lead the Church to do; we can only say that, certain things being true, God will never lead the Church to deny them.

The history of the word "Clemency" is connected with the ideas of Aristotle about Ethics and with Roman law, where it is the "Equity" of Justinian. It belongs to Byzantine law rather than to ancient Roman law, and in Byzantine law it is affected by the Greek spirit and by Christianity.

St. Athanasius defines "Economy" as something "so that the same act is not allowed at one time and at another time, being the right time, is permitted and pardonable." St. Theodore of the Studium, in writing about it, refers to St. Paul purifying himself and circumcising Timothy, and to St. Basil's temporary silence about the application of the word "God" to the Holy Spirit. He pointed out that both St. Paul and St. Basil were ready to be martyrs. It was not a question of compromise in the least degree; but it was for the good of souls at the time. So St. Cyril of Alexandria was patient with the slowness of the Antiochians and their attempt not to recognize as a heretic one who was really a heretic, in the case of Nestorius. "It may be that certain of those who are of one mind with us differ with us about something in which there is no great harm or depart from strict accuracy; yet we accept communion with them, that we may not lose all for the sake of some small matter that can afterwards be put right. For to do this would be unskilled and inappropriate to the stewards (oikonomoi) of the mysteries of God. This is making a stewardship of words and methods according to opportunity in judgement, mercy and law, but not at all in lawlessness and falsehood" (Theodore of the Studium, Letter to Naukratius, letter 59 in Migne, P.G. 99 c. 1038). The object of to Naukratius, letter 59 in Migne P.G. 99 c. 1038). The object of this "Economy" is constantly proclaiming to be true, in his words and acts, and which they do not reject deliberately.

The Incarnation is "The Divine Economy" and the whole ordering of the whole Church and of every local Church is "Economy" in the broadest sense of the word. Thus the word is used in the New Testament, although it is possible that the Parable of the Unjust Steward gave a hint to the ecclesiastical writers leading them to the particular use of the word "Economy" in the sense of the adaption of general rules to meet the needs of particular situations, in Condescension and Clemency.

In the spirit of "Economy," in this narrower sense, the Fathers purified and reissued, in Orthodox versions, certain heretical books, such as the Apocryphal Acts of some of the Saints, which they knew to be heretical books but which had found favour with the people. They accepted the baptism of heretics in this spirit, recognizing it in one particular place or one set of conditions, for the sake of "Economy of many people," if the rejection of such baptism would be an obstacle to the saving of souls. The same is true of ordinations. But it is worth noticing that a repentant schismatic bishop, although admitted as a bishop to the Church, might be declared to have no authority from the Church to ordain or promote any one, and clearly all his ordinations, after that, would be absolutely invalid. The presupposition is the Church's power, under divine guidance, to give authority to clerics. It was "Economy," although the effect of it was to make a rule stricter rather than to relax it, when the Council in Trullo forbade the bishops, while permitting priests and deacons, to live with their wives. The fact that there had been married men among bishops lawfully

in the past was not disputed and the principle of the lawfulness of their life was not overthrown, but for the good of souls, in the circumstances, the Council thought itself justified in ending the practice. Priests and deacons were forbidden to separate from their wives on the pretext of piety on similar grounds. To us in the West, here and in the curiously varied treatment of heretical sacraments in the East (not to mention the treatment of divorce), there seems to be a certain obvious inconsistency. But we have to see it as a response to concrete circumstances.

In the question of the recognition of the sacraments of heretics and schismatics and of the "heterodox" by the Orthodox Church there is a certain obscurity. Professor Alivizatos rejects the idea of indelible character as merely Latin on p. 43 in a footnote. But he rejects as "magical" the well-known view of the late Professor Dyovouniotes, according to which the Church "as the store-keeper of grace and the sovereign of the sacraments has the power to change the validity (κύρος) of the sacraments, making the invalid valid and the valid invalid." Professor Alivizatos finds this conception erroneous, "first of all because the Church is not the store-keeper of grace in an unlimited manner and in such a very wide sense, but is only the administrator of it in the sacraments, and secondly because she cannot, as it were magically, change an invalid sacrament into a valid one and vice versa. The invalid sacrament, as it does not exist, can be made to exist as valid only by a new sacramental intervention, while the valid sacrament cannot for any reason be made invalid, since the grace once given through a sacrament cannot be removed, precisely because the Church is not, in that sense, the store-keeper, but the organ of the bestowal of divine grace" (p. 42 note).

I find it very difficult to grasp the difference between this idea and the idea of indelible character. But it seems to me to be this. Whereas, for Latin theology, it is certain that a deposed priest, when he says the words of the mass, with the right materials, and with the intention to do what the Catholic Church does, actually consecrates, although it may be to his damnation, Professor Alivizatos regards this as a reply to an essentially unanswerable question. The Church takes away, in deposing a priest, not what God gives, but what she gives, not the "charisma," but the right to use it. On the other hand, she does not say that the "charisma" is not taken away. Whether God takes it away or not is for God and not for her to decide; He may perhaps take it away for a time or for ever. If the priest is restored to his priesthood and not reordained on being restored, this is because the Church trusts in the Divine Mercy. Similarly, the recognition or non-recognition of a heterodox baptism or ordination is not meant as a statement of what God has or has not given in that sacrament. It is a statement as to whether the Church, in the circumstances of the time of a person joining her ranks, accords "recognition of the consequences and results of the baptism" (pp. 45–46) or, likewise, of the ordination. By leaving out of the picture the idea of "indelible character," Professor Alivizatos, as it seems to me at least, saves himself from the necessity of regarding the repetition of a valid baptism or of a valid ordination as being, *per se*, sacrilegious. He says of ordinations by deposed bishops or by bishops of heterodox Churches whose ordinations can be recognized, that

such ordination "is ignored by the Church, as if it had not taken place, so that only when the Church, through her competent organs (bishops, spiritual courts, etc.), recognizes by 'Economy' the ordination formerly ignored, then and then only it operates and has valid results; therefore it is called 'ἰσχυρὰ' (strong, rather than valid). Before this recognition, it and its results are ignored absolutely by the Church and are treated as non-existent" (p. 46 note). But treating something as non-existent, where the Church is concerned, implies no statement as to the real position, as far as the divine "charisma" is concerned. Unlike Professor Dyovouniotes who, at any rate at one time, thought that the Church had, in theory, unlimited power to recognize the ordinations of other Churches, and could do this even for a Church in which the Apostolic Succession was not unbroken, Professor Alivizatos insists that the recognition of heterodox ordinations must be limited to "a Church accepting the sacramental character of ordination and preserving the Apostolic Succession unbroken." For the Church cannot make anything to exist where it does not exist; she can ignore, for her purposes, and recognize, for her purposes, but she does not create out of nothing. I notice that with regard to baptism "the Economy, strictly speaking, does not refer to the baptism, but to . . . the results of the baptism" (p. 45). Hence I infer that the only baptism that can be recognized is one which is already, in reality, Christian baptism, although it may be permissible to repeat it in some circumstances, if the Church should decide not to recognize it. It is not absolutely recognized. This is particularly interesting in connexion with a problem which has not yet been discussed in the East, as far as I know, the modern problem of the "Indiscriminate" administration of the sacraments in a secularized society. The ministers of the Church (for example in England) refuse to baptize a child because there is no kind of guarantee that the child will be brought up as a Christian; his parents are entirely out of touch with the Christian Church. The family, offended although desiring only "to give the child a Christian name," proceed to some sect for baptism, or even have the child baptized by a lay person with no authority from any community. Except on the theory of indelible character and absolute validity, is that baptism valid? Is the Church bound to recognize it, after refusing, for pastoral reasons, to baptize the child? Many of the Reformers, in spite of their belief in the priesthood of all Christians, rejected lay baptism, on the ground that baptism is an act of the Church and must have the authority of the Church, as admission to the Church. Perhaps we must distinguish here between the recognition of baptism and the recognition of the results of baptism.

But the case I have just mentioned is the plainest case of the sacrament "outside the Church" (ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας) in that it is a sacrament given against the will of the Church, assuming for the moment that "Discriminate Baptism" can be justified from the ecclesiastical standpoint. In the view of Professor Alivizatos, stated on pp. 81–82 of this book, "the organs of the Church . . . as stewards of the mysteries applying Economy, simply recognize sacraments completed outside the Church or contrary to the prevailing ecclesiastical order, as valid, and that only inasmuch as the necessary and known conditions were fulfilled in their completion." But he adds, "I leave on one side here the explanation of the meaning of 'outside

the Church' which would carry us into a very long explanation outside the limits of the present study. I stress only the fact that these sacraments which come to be accepted by Economy are perfected by Divine Grace in the respect in which, as completed outside the Church, they were imperfectly completed." From the point of view of any Western theologian, the greatest difficulties attend the idea of a sacrament "outside the Church." For the Roman Church, all valid baptism is baptism into the Catholic Church and all validly baptized babies are members of the Catholic Church, even although, as members of households of heretics or schismatics, they grow up in an atmosphere which will lead them into "material" heresy or schism. Even so, if they do not wish to be heretics and are in good faith, they are members of the Catholic Church still. All sacraments are sacraments of the Catholic Church and in the Catholic Church, which is, from the Roman Catholic point of view, the Roman Catholic Church. The rest of the West takes up a somewhat similar position in regarding the Visible Church as including all societies in which "the sacraments are duly ministered, in all that is necessary." Where the sacraments are, there is the Church. I can well see that the Orthodox point of view cannot possibly be that, even if only because Orthodoxy belongs to the whole Church and not merely to the supreme authority. One could hardly say that heretics belong to the Orthodox Church without self-contradiction. But it is not easy to see how any one can be really baptized, or ordained, except in the Church.

There are two very interesting passages in this book dealing with the history of the separation of East and West on pp. 54–55 and 85–88. To these I hope to refer on a later occasion. The question which I think has to be asked, about the schism, is the question not exactly of its date but of the reason for its extremely gradual evolution into a permanent chasm. I am not at all sure that either Mark of Alexandria or Demetrios Chomatenos was thinking of the Latins as "heterodox" in the modern sense. There seems to be evidence that in some places in the twelfth and even in the thirteenth century Latins who lived in the East treated the Eastern bishops as being their bishops, had their clergy ordained by them, came under the authority of Eastern Churches, and were treated by the Easterns as Orthodox, just as much as the Greeks of Cyprus and those of S. Italy were treated by the Westerns as Roman Catholics, in that they were subject to the Western authorities. The "Economy" granted in those conditions was not to people "outside the Church"; it was a concession to members of the Church who, for one reason or another, were not strictly following the canonical rules. A distinction seems to have been drawn between Latins who respected the Orthodox customs and those who did not. It therefore seems to me doubtful whether these examples from the Middle Ages can be used, as they are sometimes used, in arguments about "Economy" to-day. But they have their significance in the consideration of the question of the Church.

Professor Alivizatos has placed us all in his debt by this study, many aspects of which I have, from considerations of space, omitted to consider.

EDWARD EVERY.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD

THE IKON OF TEMOS BEING BORNE IN PROCESSION ON AUGUST 15TH.